

## Portland State University PDXScholar

---

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

Oregon Sustainable Community Digital Library

---

2-1-2008

### Meeting Notes 2008-02-01

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: [http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl\\_jpact](http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_jpact)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation, "Meeting Notes 2008-02-01 " (2008). *Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation*. Paper 456.

[http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl\\_jpact/456](http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_jpact/456)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. For more information, please contact [pdxscholar@pdx.edu](mailto:pdxscholar@pdx.edu).

# A G E N D A

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE | PORTLAND, OREGON 97232-2736  
TEL 503-797-1916 | FAX 503-797-1930



**METRO**

**MEETING: JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION RETREAT**

**DATE: February 1, 2008**

**TIME: 7:30 A.M. – 3:00 P.M.**

**PLACE: Oregon Zoo, Skyline Room**

- |                 |     |   |  |
|-----------------|-----|---|--|
| <b>7:30 AM</b>  | 1.  | <b>AGREEMENT ON AGENDA</b>  | <b>Rex Burkholder</b>                        |
| <b>8:00 AM</b>  | 2.  | <b>PURSUIT OF FUNDING MEASURES</b>  |  |
|                 | 2.1 | <b>Review of Polling</b><br>Are there key similarities or differences between various recent polls?<br>What are the key lessons?  | <b>Adam Davis</b>                            |
|                 | 2.2 | <b>Discussion of Options for Local, State and Regional Funding Measures</b><br><u>Intended Outcome:</u> Agree on how to work together on local, regional and state funding measures<br>1. Review "Straw-man" funding calendar<br>2. Review local funding initiatives for 2008<br>3. Review funding calendars from JPACT members (Wall Chart Exercise)<br>4. Discussion – Should local measures be coordinated in any way; are there some common themes (like emphasis on Maintenance & Preservation) and common mechanisms (like street utility fees and vehicle registration fees)? Should there be a regional measure in the future? Should we coordinate the purpose of the regional measure with the upcoming local measures? | <b>Michael Jordan</b>                        |
|                 |     | <b>BREAK</b>  |  |
| <b>10:30 AM</b> | #   | 5. Review Governor's framework for developing a state measure<br>6. Review proposed "Principles" for the Portland area to pursue<br>7. Discussion – How do we coordinate on developing a state measure? How do we integrate our local measures with our proposals for state measures  | <b>Randy Tucker</b><br><b>Michael Jordan</b> |
| <b>NOON</b>     | 3.  | <b>BREAK for WORKING LUNCH</b>  |  |

**12:30 PM**

## 4.1

**Andy Cotugno**

- #  
#  
#

## Olivia Clark

## 4.2

- 1.
- 2.

**2:00 PM**

## 5.1

## 5.2

**Rex Burkholder**

**3:00 PM**

7.

## Rex Burkholder

NOTE:

- #

*For agenda and schedule information, call Kelsey Newell at 503-797-1916. e-mail: [Newellk@metro.dst.or.us](mailto:Newellk@metro.dst.or.us)  
To check on closure or cancellations during inclement weather please call 503-797-1700.*

# Regional Transportation

## Public Opinion Survey Report

Prepared for Metro  
January 2008

### Presented By:

Adam Davis, Principal  
Davis, Hibbitts & Midghall  
203 SW Pine Street  
Portland, Oregon 97204

503-220-0575

[www.dhmresearch.com](http://www.dhmresearch.com)

## Research Methodology

- # Telephone survey of 600 area registered voters
  - 200 each in Multnomah, Clackamas, and Washington Counties
  - In Multnomah County, 81% were City of Portland residents
- # Stratified sample
  - Data are proportionately representative of populations within counties
  - Data for other subgroup weighted to reflect proportional representation within region
- # Margin of error
  - Sample of 600 : +/- 4.0%
  - Sample of 200: +/- 6.9%

## Top Transportation Problems

### Top Transportation Problems In Portland Area

Congestion/traffic/gridlock	26%
More/improved public transportation	11%
Road/highway maintenance	7%
Not enough light rail	6%
More freeways/highways	5%
Nothing	5%
Get rid of cars/too many cars	3%
Increasing number of roads	3%
All other responses	≤ 2%

- 34% of Washington County residents mentioned congestion and gridlock as the top transportation problem


January 2008

Metro Regional Transportation Survey  
Davis, Hibbitts & Midghall, Inc.

3

## Seriousness of Problem

How serious a problem is traffic congestion in the Portland area?



- Clackamas and Washington County residents more often thought congestion was a serious problem than did residents of Multnomah County and Portland.


January 2008

Metro Regional Transportation Survey  
Davis, Hibbitts & Midghall, Inc.

4

## Willingness to Pay More

Would you support increases in fees or taxes to improve the regional transportation system?



- ✦ Only 19% of 75+ year-olds said they would support such increases, compared to 34% in the next most reluctant cohort (18-24 year-olds) and 60% in the next closest age group (age 65-74).
- ✦ Users of public transportation and perfect voters (voted in all of the last 4 elections) were also more willing to pay.

## General Approach

Which statement comes closest to your point of view:

*"Transportation projects in the state should be funded on a statewide basis by the Oregon State legislature."*

54%

*"Funding transportation projects should be left to individual cities and counties."*

37%

## General Approach


### How to Spend Funds to Improve the Region's Transportation System?

Expand freeways/roads	19%
More/improved public transportation/mass transit	18%
Freeway/road maintenance	13%
More light rail	6%
Wise spending/money management	5%
More bicycle lanes	4%
Clear congestion problems	4%
Build more bridges	4%
No fees/taxes	3%
All other responses	≤ 2%
Don't know	19%

## Street, Road, Highway, and Bridge Projects

## Support For Road Projects

### Support for Road, Street, Highway, and Bridge Projects



January 2008

Metro Regional Transportation Survey  
Davis, Hibbitts & Midghall, Inc.

9

## Support For Road Projects

### Which road project is most important to you?

Replace or repair structurally deficient bridges	25%
Maintain and preserve existing roads	24%
Widen and improve existing highways	23%
Congestion relief on major streets and intersections	12%
Build new highways	11%

January 2008

Metro Regional Transportation Survey  
Davis, Hibbitts & Midghall, Inc.

10




## Support For Road Projects

### Priorities By Area

- ✦ Clackamas County: Repair or replace deficient bridges (29%); widen and improve highways (24%); maintain existing roads (22%).
- ✦ Washington County: Widen and improve highways (29%); provide congestion relief at intersections (21%); maintain existing roads (20%).
- ✦ Multnomah County/Portland: Repair or replace deficient bridges (31%/34%); maintain existing roads (28%/27%); widen and improve highways (18%/20%).
- ✦ Non-Portland Multnomah County: Maintain existing roads (32%); replace or repair deficient bridges, provide congestion relief on major streets, build new highways (16% each).

## Funding of Road Projects

### Support for funding measures for road projects



## Funding of Road Projects


### Best Way to Fund Road Projects

A regional street maintenance and safety fee for businesses and households at an average household rate of \$2 per month, with businesses paying their fair share	19%
A regional vehicle registration fee of \$27 per year for cars and light trucks	15%
A regional gas and diesel fuel tax of 5¢/gallon	14%
A graduated increase in the title fee not to exceed \$300 on the purchase of a new vehicle, based on gas mileage of the car	12%
A 2/10 of 1% percent sales tax on retail purchases, excluding groceries and pharmaceuticals	12%
A 2% sales tax on the price of gas	10%
Don't know	18%

## Neighborhood Transportation Projects

## Support For Neighborhood Transportation Projects

Support for Neighborhood Transportation Projects



## Support For Neighborhood Transportation Projects

Which neighborhood transportation project is most important to you?

Sidewalks where they are now missing along streets and roads and near schools	43%
Projects that reduce speeds on neighborhood streets	17%
New lanes for bicyclists on major streets	14%
Neighborhood boulevards that improve the design of major neighborhood streets	12%
Complete gaps in neighborhood and regional trail systems	7%

- Adding sidewalks was the first priority in all areas, except among non-Portland residents of Multnomah County, where it shared top honors with reducing speed on neighborhood streets.

## Mass Transit Projects


January 2008

Metro Regional Transportation Survey  
Davis, Hibbitts & Midghall, Inc.

17

## Support For Transit Projects

Support for Transit Projects



January 2008

Metro Regional Transportation Survey  
Davis, Hibbitts & Midghall, Inc.

18

## Support for Transit Projects


### Which transit project is most important to you?

Build light rail to more locations	34%
Expand bus service frequency and routes	19%
Better transit service for the elderly and disabled	17%
Replace existing buses with green buses that use alternative fuel sources	16%
Add Park & Ride facilities at MAX stations	9%

- Especially keen on light rail were Washington County residents, respondents age 35-54, area residents of 0-5 and 11-15 years, and users of public transportation.
- Non-Portland residents of Multnomah County, women, and older residents stressed better transit services to the elderly and disabled.

## Funding of Transit Projects

### Support for funding measures for transit projects



## Transportation Package


January 2008

Metro Regional Transportation Survey  
Davis, Hibbitts & Midghall, Inc.

21

## Support for Package

Support for Total Transportation Package



While the high level of support is impressive for its approval of the project mix and recognition of the need to embrace a long-term solution, the absence of specified costs does temper its significance.

January 2008

Metro Regional Transportation Survey  
Davis, Hibbitts & Midghall, Inc.

22



---

## Observations and Conclusions

---



---

## Observations and Conclusions

---

- ✦ Many Portland metropolitan area residents were concerned about traffic congestion and considered it a serious problem in the area.
- ✦ Respondents overwhelmingly accepted the argument that any solution should be long-term and comprehensive, and also widely acknowledged that it should include both road and transit elements.
- ✦ There was broad support for road projects that would repair or replace structurally deficient bridges and maintain existing transportation infrastructure. Widening and improving highways also received significant support.
- ✦ The prevailing attitude about roads was “maintain and expand existing infrastructure” rather than “build new ones.”

## Observations and Conclusions

- ✦ In regard to neighborhood transportation projects, respondents most supported adding sidewalks along roads and near schools.
  - Bike lanes, speed reduction measures, and neighborhood boulevards also won favor.
- ✦ Support for public transit projects was quite uniform.
  - Providing better service to the elderly was the most broadly favored and least opposed idea.
  - Building light rail to more areas received the most opposition (24%), but it also won high levels of support (59%) and was seen by a plurality of the sample (34%) as the most important project of those tested.
- ✦ When speaking about road projects, Washington County residents and households with children were especially keen on alleviating congestion on the area's freeways and major thoroughfares.
- ✦ Washington County residents also stood out for supporting more light rail in the transit project section of the survey.

## Observations and Conclusions

- ✦ Over half the sample at least somewhat supported paying more in fees or taxes to improve the regional transportation system
  - Support for specific funding mechanisms was typically lukewarm at best.
  - Questions about funding preferences revealed more support for fees than taxes where a choice was given.
  - Reluctance to pay new taxes was high, especially when it came to a sales tax.
- ✦ Residents acknowledge that problems will only get worse and cost more to fix if they wait to address them.
- ✦ The least controversial funding mechanism for roads was a regional street maintenance and safety fee. After that, respondents favored vehicle registration and title fees.
- ✦ Funding public transportation was a wash between the three methods that didn't involve a sales tax on retail purchases.





## Observations and Conclusions

---

- ⌘ Safety was on people's minds. Respondents wanted to repair or replace deficient bridges, maintain and preserve existing roads, put sidewalks along streets and near schools, and provide better access to public transportation for the elderly and disabled.
- ⌘ Safety-related concerns ranked high among reasons chosen by survey respondents for why it's important to do something about the transportation system.
- ⌘ Other top reasons drew on pragmatic and environmental arguments.

Transportation Funding Needs	Spring 2005	Spring 2007	Spring/Fall 2008	Spring 2009	Fall 2009
Highways, Roads and Streets					
Major Freeway Expansion	OTIA 1, 2, 3			'09 Legislature	
Spot Freeway and State Highway Projects	OTIA 1, 2, 3			'09 Legislature	
ODOT Bridges	OTIA 3				
Urban Arterial Projects	OTIA 1, 2, 3		SDC Increases		Regional Ballot
Willamette River Bridges			County Veh. Reg. Fee		
ODOT Maintenance and Preservation	OTIA 1, 2			'09 Legislature	
City/County Maintenance and Preservation			City/County adoption of vehicle registration fees, street utility districts	'09 Legislature	
				Lift the cap on local vehicle registration fee	
Transit					
Light Rail Construction		Lottery funds from '07 Legislature			Regional Ballot
Service expansion operating cost		Increased Payroll Tax Authority	Payroll Tax increases .01% over 10 years		
Green Buses					Regional Ballot
Elderly & Handicapped Service				'09 Legislature	
High Speed Passenger Rail Service				'09 Legislature	
Other Modes					
Bike/Trail construction					Regional Ballot
Boulevards					Regional Ballot
Transit Oriented Development					Regional Ballot
Regional Travel Options					
Non-Highway Freight Projects	Connect Oregon 1	Connect Oregon 2		Freight Rail	
DRAFT 1-10-08	<-----Past	Actions----->	<-----Potential Future Actions ----->		

# **Metropolitan Region Principles For a Legislative Transportation Funding Package in 2009**

**We, the local governments of the Portland Metropolitan Region, believe:**

The mounting inadequacy of funding for modernization and maintenance of Oregon's transportation system:

- Threatens the state's economy.
- Harms the long-term livability of our communities.
- Undermines public safety.
- Places the long-term value of previous investments at risk.
- Contributes to global climate change and energy dependence.

To solve this transportation funding crisis, and to guide critical decisions on transportation, we, the undersigned, support the following principles:

## **MAKE STRATEGIC, COORDINATED SYSTEM INVESTMENTS**

- Adopt a significant, coordinated, comprehensive, long-term transportation funding package that addresses the needs of the entire state through investments at the state, regional, and local levels.
- Recognize the mutually dependent relationship between our land use and transportation systems, and between these systems and the state's economic competitiveness.
- Invest transportation revenues in a multi-modal program that provides statewide economic benefits and produces a high return on investment.
- Allocate sufficient funds to address critical safety needs in communities statewide, and to support the maintenance and preservation of new and existing transportation facilities, which represent a multi-billion dollar investment by the citizens of Oregon.

## **REINFORCE OREGON'S LIVABILITY AND SUSTAINABILITY**

- Design transportation investment programs to reward practices that best enhance the State's goals with respect to public health and safety, livability, global climate change, economic prosperity and environmental stewardship.

## **INVEST IN ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS**

- Invest in key projects that strengthen freight movement, improve system reliability and safety, and expand access and transit to traditional downtowns and other centers of commerce.

## **MAINTAIN FLEXIBILITY AND EQUITY FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENTS**

- Allow and encourage different approaches and funding mechanisms to meet the differing needs of Oregon's state, regional, and local transportation systems.
- Facilitate or expand funding authorities available to local and regional governments and eschew unfunded mandates.
- Address state and local transportation needs through the distribution formula providing 50% to the state, 30% to counties, and 20% to cities, and retain local flexibility as to how these funds may be used.

## **Vision Committee**

Chair – Pat Reiten, Pacificorp

The first subcommittee is being called the **Vision Subcommittee**. This group's task is two fold. First they will be asked to conceptualize a transportation package that the Governor can present to the 2009 Legislature. Second, and perhaps most important this group will be asked to consider how we can work together to shift the nature of the debate surrounding transportation. Ideally the Governor would appreciate seeing transportation as an institutionalized part of the legislatures agenda, not an issue that rises to importance every few sessions. This group will be asked to consider long term funding mechanisms and is encouraged to think creatively to ensure that our transportation system is environmentally sustainable.

## **Governance Committee**

Chair – Steve Clark, Community Newspapers


The second subcommittee will tackle the issues surrounding **Governance**. The group will consider the issue of how transportation funds are invested. This focus will be on ensuring that the Area Commissions on Transportation, local governing bodies, and stakeholders identify objective criteria for transportation investment. Additionally, this group will be asked to ensure that funding strategies, based on adopted policies, will involve an open discussion for citizen input and direction to guarantee that the funding delivers what the citizens support.

## **Public Awareness Committee**

Chair – Chip Terhune, Governor's Chief of Staff

The third subcommittee will focus on how to best communicate with the public regarding transportation needs. This group will initiate an external review of polling and focus group information to ensure that the Governor and legislature have up to date information about what messages resonate with the public.

# Vision Subcommittee Timeline



## Recently Passed and Currently Contemplated Local Transportation Funding Initiatives in:

### Clackamas County:

Jurisdiction	Type of Initiative	Program Description	Estimated New Revenues	Status
Clackamas County	Street Maintenance Fee Vehicle Registration Fee Gas Tax	The County is currently considering implementing a monthly street maintenance fee of up to \$5.00 per residential property; <b>-OR-</b> an annual Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) of up to \$27.00/vehicle; <b>-OR-</b> a gas tax of up to \$0.03/gallon.		Currently under consideration.
Canby	Local Gas Tax	\$0.03/gallon gas tax		Began collection of tax in January 2008.
Canby	Street Maintenance Fee	Fee on residences to pay for maintenance of city streets. Monthly fee of \$1.04-\$5.00 per residential property.		Began collection of tax in January 2008.

Happy Valley	Street Maintenance Fee	The City is currently considering implementing a street maintenance fee.		Currently under consideration.
Milwaukie	Local Gas Tax	\$0.02/gallon gas tax		Began collection of tax in 2007.
Milwaukie	Street Maintenance Fee	Fee on residences to pay for maintenance of city streets. Single family and multi-family units pay \$3.35 and \$2.20 per monthly respectively.		Began collection of tax in 2007.
Milwaukie	Privilege Tax	1.5%		Began collection of tax in 2007.
Oregon City	Street Maintenance Fee	The City is currently considering implementing a street maintenance fee.		Currently under consideration.
Sandy	Local Gas Tax	The City established a \$0.01/gallon gas tax in 2002.		The City has continued to maintain this tax.
Sandy	Local Gas Tax	The City proposed to increase the local gas tax from \$0.01.		The City's proposal was defeated by the voters in November 2007.
West Linn	Street Maintenance Fee	Fee on residences to pay for maintenance of city streets. Monthly fee of \$4.40 per residential property.		Began collection of tax in January 2008.

West Linn	Misc. Taxes & Fees	The City is considering implementing additional taxes and/or fees.		Currently under consideration.
-----------	--------------------	--	--	--------------------------------

## Multnomah County:

Jurisdiction	Type of Initiative	Program Description	Estimated New Revenues	Status
Multnomah County	Vehicle Registration Fee	The County is proposing a \$24.00 Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) for the May 2008 ballot. The VRF will be dedicated to the maintenance and/or reconstruction of the Willamette River Bridges. The revenues will be used to bond \$100 million for the local contribution on the Sellwood Bridge and the remainder of the revenues (\$5.2M/year) will be used for projects on the other Willamette River Bridges. Sunset in 20 years.	The VRF will generate approximately \$13 million per year and will sunset in 20 years.	The County Board is scheduled to take action on this proposal on Feb. 21, 2008. IGAs under consideration now.



City of Portland	Street Utility Fee	The City implemented the Safe, Sound and Green Streets program which establishes a monthly fee of \$4.45 per household and \$83 average per business	The maintenance fee will generate \$24 million per year.	Approved by the City Council in January 2008.
------------------	--------------------	--	--	---

### Washington County:

Jurisdiction	Type of Initiative	Program Description	Estimated New Revenues	Status
Washington County	Traffic Impact Fee* (TIF) or System Development Charge (SDC)	Target is to double current development related revenues to \$32-34 million annually by converting existing TIF into a SDC or adding a new countywide SDC on top of existing TIF.	\$16-17 million annually in new revenues	Options under review by Washington County Coordinating Committee. If decision is made to proceed, then initiative would go on May 2008 ballot.

\*Note: In 1990, Washington County adopted its current TIF for new development in the unincorporated county and within all cities in the county. In 1990, the city of Tualatin adopted a Road Utility Fee for street maintenance that generates approximately \$350,000-\$400,000 annually.

Washington County	Major Streets Transportation Improvement Program (MSTIP4)	Increase MSTIP funding for major capital projects to \$70 million annually (including current MSTIP General Fund allocation of approximately \$26 million annually). Program to cover 2013-2019 time period.	\$44 million annually in new revenues exclusive of General Fund contribution.	200% project list currently being reviewed by WCCC. If decision is made to proceed, then initiative would go on November 2008 ballot.
Beaverton	System Development Charge (SDC)	Undetermined. May depend upon direction of Washington Co. TIF/SDC initiative	Undetermined	Begin discussion at Council work sessions in February or March
Beaverton	Street Maintenance Fee	Undetermined	Undetermined	Begin discussion at Council work sessions in February or March
Hillsboro	Transportation Utility Fee	Fee on residences and businesses to pay for maintenance of city streets. Tentative proposed rates are approximately \$3.50 for single-family and \$2.40/month for multi-family. Business rates are being determined. Fee would free up gas tax funds for bike and pedestrian projects.	\$2.8 to \$2.9 million annually	Proposal under development with decision targeted for Spring 2009.

Sherwood	System Development Charge	City charge on new development for future roadway capacity needs. Net amount collected for SDC is calculated as the total transportation cost/unit minus the County TIF cost (e.g., city total transportation cost/unit for single-family residential is \$6648 and County TIF is \$3020, resulting in net city SDC of \$3628). Note that county TIF is paid in addition to city SDC.	Unavailable	Effective as of September 2007
Tigard	Street Maintenance Fee	Fee on residences and businesses to pay for maintenance of city streets. Single and multi-family units pay \$2.18 per month. Non-residential customers pay \$0.78 per parking space and gas stations pay \$0.78 per pump.	\$900,000+ annually	Implementation began in April 2004. Fees to be reviewed pending completion of new 5-year maintenance plan within the next 1-2 months.

Tigard	Local Gas Tax	\$0.03/gallon gas tax to pay for \$4.5 million in improvements at Hwy. 99W/Greenburg/Main St. intersection.	\$900,000 annually in new revenues or not more than a total of \$5 million over intended 5-year (2007-2011) life of tax.	Began collection of tax April 1, 2007. Tax is now projected to only raise \$3.5 million over five-year period so collection may be extended beyond 2011.
--------	---------------	---	--	--



## FOR JPACT DISCUSSION

# Funding Responsibility for Different Elements of the Regional Transportation System

### Background

Since the 1970's, the Portland metropolitan region has relied on a consensus-based approach to address mutual interests for land use and transportation planning. In this spirit, the region needs to reach agreement on these transportation considerations as part of the state component of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP):

- (1) a definition of the regional transportation system
- (2) funding responsibility for different elements of the regional system; and
- (3) regional transportation priorities.

This includes clarifying local, regional and state responsibilities for maintaining and expanding the regional transportation system in support of the 2040 Growth Concept.

### 2035 RTP Regional System Definition

As a starting point, the federal component of the 2035 RTP defines the regional transportation system as follows:

1. *All state transportation facilities (including interstate, state, regional and district highways and their bridges and ramps).*
2. *All arterial facilities and their bridges.*
3. *Transportation facilities within designated 2040 centers, corridors, industrial areas, mainstreets and station communities.*
4. *All high capacity transit and regional transit systems and their bridges.*
5. *All regional bicycle and pedestrian facilities and their bridges, including regional trails with a transportation function.*
6. *All other transportation facilities and services that JPACT and the Metro Council determine necessary to complete the regional plan, including Willamette River Bridges, Interstate Bridges, bridges that are part of other elements of the regional system, freight and passenger intermodal facilities, airports, rail facilities and marine transportation facilities.*
7. *Any other transportation facility, service or strategy that is determined by JPACT and the Metro Council to be of regional interest because it has a regional need or impact (e.g. transit-oriented development, transportation system management and demand management strategies, local street connectivity, culverts that serve as barriers to fish passage and throughway overcrossings).*

This definition reflects all the elements of the transportation system that are of mutual interest to the people living and working in this region. Together, these facilities, services and strategies constitute an integrated and interconnected system that supports desired land use and all modes of travel for people and goods movement.

**What criteria should be used to define what part of the regional system should be a state responsibility, a regional responsibility or a local responsibility?**

	<b>Owner-Based Criteria Example</b>	<b>Capacity-Based Criteria Example</b>	<b>Function-Based Criteria Example</b>	<b>Place-Based Criteria Example</b>
<b>State Responsibility</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State-owned facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OM&amp;P of state-owned facilities.</li> <li>State-owned facilities and their bridges and ramps with greater than XX,XXX ADT.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OM&amp;P of state-owned facilities.</li> <li>Interstate and statewide highways and their bridges and ramps.</li> <li>Inter-urban transit.</li> <li>Bike and pedestrian facilities that are part of other elements of the state system.</li> <li>System and demand management on above listed facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access to domestic and international intermodal facilities (e.g. air and marine terminals).</li> <li>Inter-urban transit.</li> </ul>
<b>Regional Responsibility</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional travel options programs and services.</li> <li>Transit-oriented development.</li> <li>High capacity and regional transit systems and their bridges.</li> <li>Regional trails with a transportation function.</li> <li>Port of Portland Facilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Arterial facilities and their bridges with greater than XX,XXX ADT.</li> <li>High capacity transit and frequent bus systems and their bridges.</li> <li>Regional trails with a transportation function.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional highways and their bridges and ramps.</li> <li>Major arterial facilities.</li> <li>High capacity transit and frequent bus systems and their bridges.</li> <li>Bicycle and pedestrian facilities that are part of other elements of the regional system.</li> <li>Regional trails with a transportation function.</li> <li>Willamette River Bridges.</li> <li>Freight and passenger intermodal facilities, airports, rail facilities and marine transportation facilities.</li> <li>System and demand management on above listed facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transportation facilities that directly connect or are located within designated central city, regional centers, industrial areas, and freight and passenger intermodal facilities.</li> <li>High capacity and regional transit systems that connect primary 2040 land use components.</li> <li>Bicycle and pedestrian facilities that connect primary 2040 land use components.</li> <li>Regional trails with a transportation function that connect primary 2040 land use components.</li> </ul>
<b>City/County Responsibility</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Locally-owned facilities.</li> <li>Local trails.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OM&amp;P of locally-owned facilities.</li> <li>Collector, local and residential streets.</li> <li>Arterial facilities with less than XX,XXX ADT.</li> <li>Community and special needs transit.</li> <li>Bicycle and pedestrian facilities on above listed facilities.</li> <li>Local trails.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OM&amp;P of locally-owned facilities.</li> <li>District highways and their bridges and ramps.</li> <li>Minor arterial and collector facilities.</li> <li>Local/residential streets.</li> <li>Community and special needs transit.</li> <li>Local trails.</li> <li>System and demand management strategies on above listed facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transportation facilities that are located within designated town centers, mainstreets, corridors, station communities, employment areas and neighborhoods.</li> </ul>

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING	)	RESOLUTION NO. 08-3891
PORTLAND REGIONAL FEDERAL	)	
TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES FOR	)	
FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR 2009	)	Introduced by Councilor Rex Burkholder
APPROPRIATIONS		

WHEREAS, the Portland metropolitan region relies heavily on various federal funding sources to adequately plan for and develop the region's transportation infrastructure; and

WHEREAS, Metro must comply with a wide variety of federal requirements related to transportation planning and project funding; and

WHEREAS, the Metro region's Congressional delegation has advised the region's transportation agencies to develop a coordinated request for legislation related to the annual federal transportation appropriations bill; and

WHEREAS, Metro's Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) recommended adoption of this resolution at their regular meeting on February 14, 2008; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Metro Council hereby approves Exhibit A of this resolution, entitled "Metro Area FY 09 Federal Transportation Appropriations Request List" and directs the Chief Operating Officer to submit this resolution to the Oregon Congressional delegation.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this \_\_\_ day of February 2008.

---

David Bragdon, Council President

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

---

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

FY 09 Federal Transportation Appropriations Request List			
Project Type/Name	Appropriation Request (\$million)	Source	Purpose
<b>Northwest National Highway Earmark Priority</b>			
Columbia River Crossing (ODOT)	\$ 3.00	Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	Preliminary Engineering
Columbia River Crossing (WsDOT)	\$ 3.00	Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	Preliminary Engineering
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 6.00</b>		
<b>Regional Transit Earmark Priorities</b>			
Portland - Streetcar Loop Project	\$ 40.00	FTA Small Starts	Construction
TriMet Bus Replacement	\$ 13.184	FTA 5309 Bus & Bus Facilities	Replacement
South Corridor I-205/Portland Mall LRT Project (T/M)	\$ 80.00	FTA 5309 New Starts	Construction
Lake Oswego to Portland Transit Project DEIS	\$ 4.00	FTA Section 5339 Funds	Draft EIS
SMART Bus - Wilsonville Multimodal Facility	\$ 2.00	FTA 5309 Bus & Bus Facilities	Construction
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 139.184</b>		
<b>Regional Support for OTA Transit Priorities</b>			
South Clackamas: Bus Replacement	\$ 0.50	FTA 5309 Bus & Bus Facilities	Replacement
City of Sandy: Bus Replacement Facility	\$ 1.00	FTA 5309 Bus & Bus Facilities	Replacement/Facility
City of Canby: Bus and Bus Facility	\$ 0.95	FTA 5309 Bus & Bus Facilities	Replacement/Facility
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 2.45</b>		
<b>Regional Highway Priorities</b>			
Port of Portland: Airport Way/I-205 Northbound Access	\$ 2.00	Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	
Port of Portland I-84/257th Ave. Troutdale Interchange	\$ 2.00	Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	
Gresham: Springwater/US 26 Industrial Access	\$ 5.00	TCSP; STP	Construction
ODOT:I-5/I-205 Interchange	\$ 2.00	Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	Construction
Washington County: I-5/Highway 99W Connector	\$ 10.00	STP	Right-of-Way
Washington County: Hwy 217 Beaverton-Hillsdale Hwy to Allen Blvd. Interchange	\$ 0.75	NHS	PE/DEIS
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 21.75</b>		
<b>Regional Street and Other Regional Priorities</b>			
Portland: NE Cully Blvd. Street Improvement	\$ 1.60	Surface Transportation Projects	Construction
Portland: Eastside Burnside/Couch Couplet	\$ 2.50	Surface Transportation Projects	Construction
Milwaukie: Kellogg Creek Bridge Replacement	\$ 1.50	TCSP	Replacement
Wilsonville: Kinsman Road	\$ 2.00	STP	Construction
Metro: Pacific University TOD Project	\$ 1.50	STP, TCSP Funds	Construction
Metro: Trails	\$ 3.00	TCSP	Construction/Planning
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 12.10</b>		
<b>Non-Transportation Appropriations Bills</b>			
Port of Portland: Columbia River Channel Deepening	\$ 29.00	Energy & Water	Construction
Multnomah County: Beaver creek Culverts	\$ 5.00	Fish & Wildlife	Construction
Clackamas County: Willamette Locks	\$ 5.00	Corps of Engineers	Operating
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 39.00</b>		
<b>Grand Total - Transportation Appropriations</b>			
<b>Grand Total - Transportation Appropriations</b>	<b>\$ 220.48</b>		



## **STAFF REPORT**

### **IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 08-3891, FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING PORTLAND REGIONAL FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES FOR FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR 2009 APPROPRIATIONS**

---

Date: December 11, 2007

Prepared by: Andy Cotugno

## **BACKGROUND**

The region annually produces a position paper that outlines the views of the Metro Council and the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), a regional body that consists of local elected and appointed officials, on issues concerning transportation funding that are likely to be considered by Congress during the coming year. This year priorities are limited to the FY '09 appropriations bill. Next year, the focus will be on the new six-year authorization bill.

The Portland region is pursuing an aggressive agenda to implement a high-capacity transit system. This effort involves implementing two projects concurrently within the next three to five years: opening the Wilsonville to Beaverton commuter rail and completing construction of the I-205/Downtown LRT. Project development is also underway for the next LRT corridor to Milwaukie and streetcar to the Eastside and Lake Oswego. Additionally, there are several complementary projects for which the region is requesting funding: bus and bus facility purchases regionwide, Wilsonville Park and Ride, highway projects and others. All of these projects have a strong economic development emphasis.

Oregon and Washington continue developing a cooperative strategy to address the transportation needs in the Columbia River Crossing Corridor through a multi-modal project. Furthermore, this resolution calls out the Columbia River Crossing separately for funding through the Federal Highway Administration. This is in recognition of the regional and national significance of the I-5 corridor and this segment, particularly relating to the impact on movement of freight. The intent is to have a preferred alternative for the Columbia River Crossing defined through the NEPA process in 2008 to allow the region to seek designation in the next authorization bill as a "Project of National and Regional Significance." Designation of the Columbia River Crossing separately is not intended as an exclusive priority to the exclusion of funding for other projects. In addition, it is in recognition that other projects will be so designated in the future, much like the multi-year, multi-project approach to implementing a regional light rail system. Finally, funding for the Columbia River Crossing is with the understanding that the analysis that is underway will likely lead to identification of improvements beyond the project area that may need to be addressed in the future.

Beyond these regional transit and highway priorities, the resolution endorses a list of priority projects for earmarking through the federal highway appropriation from throughout the region. To ensure this resolution is limited to the highest priorities, the list is limited to no more than two projects per agency or subregional group of local governments. Included in the list are two priorities from Metro: A TOD project in partnership with Pacific University in Hillsboro by the Metro Planning Department and trail projects by the Metro Parks and Greenspaces Department. In addition this resolution endorses the project requests outside Metro's boundary from the transit districts surrounding Metro in Oregon and developed by the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council.

This FY '09 appropriations request for earmarked funding from SAFTEA-LU represents the consolidated regional request. Additional independent requests should not be submitted by any member jurisdiction or agency represented by JPACT (with exception of ODOT outside the metro region). Each member jurisdiction has limited their requests to two priorities each.

## ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

1. **Known Opposition** None known.
2. **Legal Antecedents** Projects within the region earmarked for federal funding must be consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan, adopted by Metro Resolution No. 07-3831B, For the Purpose of Approving the Federal Component of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update, Pending the Air Quality Conformity Analysis, on December 13, 2007.
3. **Anticipated Effects** Resolution would provide the US Congress and the Oregon Congressional delegation specifically with the region's priorities for transportation funding for use in the federal transportation appropriation process.
4. **Budget Impacts** Metro is involved in planning related to several of the projects included in the priorities paper and must approve many of the requested funding allocations. Failure to obtain funding for one or more of the projects could affect the FY 09-10 Planning Department budget. However, most of the funding requests deal with implementation projects sponsored by jurisdictions other than Metro.

## RECOMMENDED ACTION

Approve Resolution 08-3891 for submission to the Oregon Congressional delegation for consideration in the Federal Fiscal Year '09 Appropriations Bill.

**Date:** January 31, 2008

**To:** JPACT

**From:** Olivia Clark, Executive Director

**Subject:** “Outside the Box” Visits in D.C.

---

## Overview

Historically, the JPACT members meet annually with the Oregon Congressional delegation to share their support for the region’s transportation appropriations requests. This March 2008 presents the opportunity for JPACT leadership to also go “outside the box” in a parallel track and meet with some key Members of Congress, staff and stakeholders who have not been on the itinerary in the past.

A main reason why this approach will be useful is that the stars are aligning for climate change to be an important part of the debate over the next surface transportation bill when Congress reauthorizes highway and transit programs in 2009. In fact, there is a potential the two issues will be moving on Capitol Hill simultaneously in 2009. However, many members of Congress do not understand the nexus between climate change and transportation policy.

JPACT has an opportunity to help shape the debate at this early stage and encourage key players in Washington to embrace the same pro-transit, smart growth principles that the Portland Metropolitan region has used so effectively to improve livability and reduce vehicle miles traveled. A series of meetings that allow us to tell the region’s success story, offer our policy and political support, and encourage innovative and creative thinking when it comes to the nexus between transportation and climate change.

## The Portland Metropolitan Region’s Story

In the words of Congressman Jim Oberstar, Chair of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, the Portland Region’s story can be a template for the rest of the country. We need to make sure that the policymakers understand what the region has accomplished and how it has done it.

The region’s combination of transportation investments with regional land use planning and the construction of an extensive transit network led to transit ridership outpacing vehicle miles traveled, bucking the national trend. We are the 26<sup>th</sup> largest urban area, but rank 11<sup>th</sup> in total transit ridership. The result is that the City of Portland’s greenhouse gas emissions are virtually flat since 1990.

The region is a model and we should highlight it to let key players in Washington know that greenhouse gas emissions can be reduced through intelligent land use planning and a commitment to investing in transit while reducing congestion and strengthening the economy.

## The Backdrop

The Senate Environment and Public Works Committee (EPW) passed the Lieberman-Warner "America's Climate Security Act of 2007" in early December. The goal of this landmark cap and trade legislation is "to establish the core of a Federal program that will reduce United States greenhouse gas emissions substantially enough between 2007 and 2050 to avert the catastrophic impacts of global climate change." The legislation passed the committee by a mostly party line vote (Sen. Warner was the only Republican to vote in favor of it) and may be considered by the full Senate in the coming months. Supporters need to garner a filibuster-proof 60-vote majority in order to move the bill through the Senate. They are close, but not there yet. Pro-transit amendments to the Lieberman-Warner bill are possible on the Senate floor and we should support those efforts. An example is the amendment offered by Senator Carper that would make certain some of the revenue from a carbon tax be diverted to transit projects.

The House has yet to move on similar legislation. The Energy and Commerce Committee is not expected to introduce legislation until spring or summer and it remains possible that the House will wait for a new Congress and a new President in 2009 before it seriously begins to move climate change legislation.

Most people assume that no serious climate change legislation will be signed into law until there is a new administration. A likely scenario is that 2008 is a practice run and the real climate change legislation will be crafted and passed in 2009, at the same time Congress is moving legislation to reauthorize surface transportation legislation.

## Potential Meetings to request

**Congressman Ed Markey (D-MA), Chairman, Select Committee for Energy Independence and Global Warming.** Chairman Markey's committee was created in 2007 by Speaker Pelosi to create a stronger focus on climate change for the new Democratic majority. While it has no legislative authority, it will play a key role as a counterweight to the perceived pro-auto industry bias of the Chair of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, Rep. John Dingell (D-MI).

**Dan Lashoff, National Resources Defense Council.** NRDC is one of the key environmental groups in Washington and one that understands the connection between transportation policy and climate change better than most.

**Key environment and transportation committee members and staff, Senate Environment and Public Works Committee.** The EPW Committee is the Senate lead on climate change and the highway portion of the surface transportation bill. This group would include Kathy Dedrick (former staff to Cong. DeFazio), who knows the region and our issues very well.

**Jim Kolb, Amy Scarton (former staff to Cong. Blumenauer), House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Subcommittee on Highways and Transit.** The House T&I Committee authorizes all transportation programs and will write the House version of SAFETEA-LU reauthorization.

**Bill Millar, President, American Public Transportation Association.** APTA needs encouragement to lead the fight to ensure that any climate change legislation promotes investment in transit and that any transportation reauthorization bill enhance transit's traditional role due to the need to address climate change.

# FY2008

FY08 Federal Transportation Appropriation Request List				Nov. 8, 2007 Final THUD Bill Conference
Project Type/Name	Appropriation Request (\$million)	House	Senate	
<b>Regional Highway Projects</b>				
I-5 / 99 W Connector (Washco)	\$2.5 M			
Columbia River Crossing (ODOT)	\$5 M	\$250,000	\$1,000,000	\$750,000.00
I-5 Wilsonville (ODOT)	\$3 M	\$500,000		\$500,000.00
Port of Portland: Airport Way/I-205 Northbound	\$2 M			
Port of Portland/Mult.Co: Troutdale Interchange I-84 & 257	\$1 M			
Highway 217 Corridor (Washco)	\$2 M	\$250,000		\$750,000.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$15.5 M</b>	<b>\$1,000,000</b>	<b>\$1,000,000</b>	
<b>Regional Transit Priorities</b>				
Washington County Commuter Rail (T/M)	\$0.27 M			
I-205/Portland Mall Light Rail (T/M)	\$80 M	\$80,000,000	\$80,000,000.00	\$80,000,000.00
Milwaukie - PE/FEIS (T/M)	\$4 M			
Bus Replacement (T/M)	\$7.7 M			
SMART Bus - Wilsonville	\$1.75 M			
Streetcar Prototype (COP & T/M)	\$1. M			
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$94.72 M</b>	<b>\$80,000,000.00</b>	<b>\$80,000,000.00</b>	
<b>Local Project Priorities</b>				
Portland: I-5/North Macadam Access	\$2 M		\$500,000.00	\$375,000.00
Portland: East Burnside/Couch Couplet	\$2 M			
Gresham: Springwater/US 26 Industrial Access	\$5 M			
Wilsonville: Kinsman Road	\$2 M			
Milwaukie: Kellogg Creek Bridge Replacement	\$1.5 M			
Metro: TOD Revolving Fund	\$5 M			
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$17.5 M</b>		<b>\$500,000.00</b>	
<b>Non-Transportation Appropriations Bills</b>				
Port of Portland: Columbia River Channel Deepening	\$25 M			
Multnomah County: Beaver Creek Culverts	\$5 M			
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$30 M</b>			
<b>Support of OTA Transit Request</b>				
Sandy: Bus Replacement	0.44 M	\$150,000.00		\$400,000.00
South Clackamas: Bus Replacement	0.244 M			
Canby: Bus Replacement & Facility	0.35 M			
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1.03 M</b>	<b>\$150,000.00</b>		
<b>Support for Washington/Clark County Priorities</b>				
Columbia River Crossing	\$5 M			
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$5 M</b>			
<b>Grand Total - Transportation Appropriations</b>	<b>\$163.75 M</b>	<b>\$81,150,000.00</b>	<b>\$81,500,000.00</b>	<b>\$82,775,000.00</b>

# ***Recommendations on Federal Transportation Policy From The Region That Works***

As the nation's **23<sup>rd</sup> largest metropolitan area**, the Portland metropolitan region has successfully integrated transportation planning with land use planning to support a vibrant, growing economy in a competitive global marketplace while reducing greenhouse gases, meeting air quality standards, reducing energy consumption, and building a livable, walkable community that is responsive to our changing demographics. The Portland region is a model of mobility management for federal transportation policy. Regional results include:

- **1<sup>st</sup>** most bike-able city in the U.S.
- **5<sup>th</sup>** most walkable metropolitan area in the U.S.
- **8<sup>th</sup>** least sprawling metropolitan area in the U.S.
- **8<sup>th</sup>** in the U.S. for transit ridership per capita
- **11<sup>th</sup>** in the U.S. for total transit ridership
- Went from **180 bad air days to zero**
- **Lowest VMT growth** per capita in the United States
- **33<sup>rd</sup>** rank in the U.S. in congestion cost and delay due to congestion per peak traveler
- Virtually **no increase** in greenhouse gases since 1990

Based on its experience and dramatic results, the Portland metropolitan region recommends that federal policy makers focus their upcoming transportation policy discussions and actions in these three areas:

1. **Link Transportation Policy With Land Use Policy.**
2. **Make Global Economic Competitiveness** a standard for transportation investment in the movement of freight and people in metropolitan areas.
3. **Address Global Climate Change and Energy Security** by targeting transportation investments in areas that make a real difference in supporting economic growth while reducing greenhouse gases and energy consumption; accomplish this both with technologies that improve energy efficiency and with methods that reduce demand through multi-modal transportation and supportive land use patterns.
4. **Establish Long-Term Stable Funding** to both protect and expand our critical national assets.

## **Summary DRAFT – 01/24/08**

### **2008 Oregon Transportation Commission Work Plan October 2007 OTC Workshop**

#### **Work Item 1:      Transportation Funding**

Lead Staff:              Chris Warner

Brief description of issue and expected outcomes:

- Business Summit roll-out.
- Strategy for 2009 Legislative Session.
- Strategy for 2011 Legislative Session and beyond.
- Tolling Policy Adoption.
- Communication Plan.

#### **Work Item 2:      Strategic Investment Analysis and Project Investment Criteria Development – Are we investing in the most cost effective solutions?**

Lead Staff:              Jerri Bohard

Brief description of issue and expected outcomes:

- White paper on multimodal trade offs providing staff guidance as to next steps.
- Development of methodology for RETURN ON INVESTMENT analysis.
- Review and refinement of capital project investment criteria for Statewide Transportation Improvement Program.

#### **Work Item 3:      Rail Assessment and Action Strategy**

Lead Staff:              Kelly Taylor

Brief description of issue and expected outcomes:

- Assessment of the current state of the rail system.

- Develop strategies to preserve existing rail lines.

**Work Item 4:      Governance-Cross-Jurisdictional Relationships – “How do we govern the entire system.”**

Lead Staff:              Doug Tindall

Brief description of issue and expected outcomes:

- Examine a statewide decision making process that involves local road/transit authorities, Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Area Commissions on Transportation.
- Prepare a white paper outlining the potential of overall better transportation outcomes through a change in the funding allocation process.
- Present the white paper to the existing Transportation Policy Group – made up of cities, counties, Metropolitan Planning Organizations and the state.

**Work Item 5:      Development Mitigation Impacts**

Lead Staff:              Jerri Bohard

Brief description of issue and expected outcomes:

- Agreement on procedure/process for determining reasonably likely impacts.
- Augment standards in Oregon Highway Plan.
- Approve work program/strategies to move away from “case-by-case” approach.

**Work Item 6:      Project Delivery Performance Improvement**

Lead Staff:              Doug Tindall

Brief description of issue and expected outcomes:

- Expand productivity gains made in the OTIA I, II, III project delivery.
- Develop strategies to deliver another large program.



**Work Item 7:      Systems Optimization/Operational Improvement Strategy Development**

Lead Staff:              Doug Tindall

Brief description of issue and expected outcomes:

- Develop a strategy to significantly improve performance of existing systems and reduce congestion.
- A plan to address transportation needs from a demand management perspective.

**Work Item 8:      Federal Reauthorization Strategy**

Lead Staff:              Travis Brouwer

Brief description of issue and expected outcomes:

- Develop an earmark policy framework that sets forth priorities, processes, and policies related to ODOT and local agency earmark requests and approve a list of projects to seek funding.
- Develop department priorities and federal statutory policy changes to seek in 2009.
- A specific plan for Columbia River Crossing.

# **2008 Oregon Transportation Commission Monitoring Items**

## **A. Metro's Regional Transportation Plan – OTC Involvement**

Lead Staff: Jason Tell

Brief description of issue and expected outcomes:

- Update OTC on Regional Transportation Plan progress.
- Federal consistency deadline.
- Transportation Planning Rule compliance deadline; development of this will require consideration of alternative mobility standards and performance measures.

## **B. Freight Plan**

Lead Staff: Jerri Bohard

Brief description of issue and expected outcomes:

- Gap analysis of freight needs.
- Scope out areas of interest.
- Develop working papers.
- Review work with key stakeholders.

## **C. *ConnectOregon* II – Project Selection**

Lead Staff: Jack Evans

Brief description of issue and expected outcomes:

- Work components include: managing the application design, outreach, application review and OTC project selection processes through June 2008; coordinating a smooth transition to Highway Division's Local Government Section for selected project implementation.

## **D. Employee Recruitment/Retention – Strategies**

Lead Staff: Cathy Nelson

Brief description of issue and expected outcomes:

- Present Dye Management report to OTC.
- Present refined recruitment/retention strategies and initiatives to the OTC.
- Complete policy option package if needed.

## **E. ODOT Performance Benchmarks**

Lead Staff: Lorna Youngs

Brief description of issue and expected outcomes:

- Regular reports on the ODOT performance “dashboard”.

## 2008 JPACT Work Program

	<p>July</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lake Oswego to Portland DEIS Funding Plan</li> <li>• HCT Plan Briefing</li> </ul>
<p>February 14, 2008</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Federal Project Priorities</li> <li>• MTIP Policy Direction - Discussion</li> </ul>	<p>August</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarterly RTP Worksession</li> </ul>
<p>March 5,6 – DC Trip</p> <p>March 13, 2008</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direction on RTP – Next Phase</li> <li>• MTIP Policy Direction - Approval</li> <li>• RTO 5-year Strategic Plan</li> </ul>	<p>September</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intro Staff Recommended Reg Flex Fund 1<sup>st</sup> Cut</li> <li>• Intro ODOT TIP Projects</li> <li>• I-5/99W Preferred Alternative RTP Amendment</li> </ul>
<p>April 10, 2008</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unified Work Program Approval</li> </ul>	<p>October</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Release MTIP for public comment</li> </ul>
<p>May</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarterly RTP Worksession</li> </ul>	<p>November</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarterly RTP Worksession</li> </ul> <p>MTIP Hearings</p>
<p>June</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Columbia River Crossing Preferred Alternative RTP Amendment</li> <li>• TriMet 5-year TIP Comments</li> </ul> <p>Reg. Flex Fund Application Deadline</p>	<p>December</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sellwood Bridge Preferred Alternative RTP Amendment</li> <li>• Sunrise Project Preferred Alternative RTP Amendment</li> </ul>